

U.S. Serial No. 10/571,044
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2007
Amendment dated: February 21, 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have modified the illustrations of Figures 1-5 to incorporate the "Prior Art" reference requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings. In regard to the objections to claims 1 and 7, Applicants have modified these claims for the purpose of overcoming these objections. Applicants respectfully submit that the modified claim language is fully supported by the specification and all requisite antecedent basis is provided. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to claims 1 and 7.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. sections 102 and 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicants presently claimed invention. More specifically, Applicants claimed invention is directed to an improved backlight structure for a display, such as, for example a liquid crystal display apparatus. In accordance with the present invention, a diffuser structure advantageously incorporates diffusion elements within the body of the diffuser structure. The diffuser structure is primarily comprised of a first body of resin material and the individual diffusion elements contained within the diffuser structure are comprised of a second resin material. For the purpose of highlighting the distinctions between the presently claimed invention and the prior art, Applicants have modified each of the independent claims to specify that:

the diffuser is comprised of a continuous body of a first resin material and diffusion elements, each of the diffusion elements being comprised of a second resin material different from the first resin material, and the diffusion elements are located within the continuous body of the

U.S. Serial No. 10/571,044
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2007
Amendment dated: February 21, 2008

first resin material and are surrounded by portions of the first resin material

These features of the present invention are described throughout the specification and specific support for this limitation can be found in the specification beginning on page 24 at line 29 and continuing through page 33, for example.

Additional features of the presently claimed invention are directed to the incorporation of prismatic protrusions on one or more sides of the diffuser body structure. Advantageously, these prismatic protrusions further enhance the desired optical characteristics of the diffuser. Applicant's respectfully submit that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to provide any teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding the invention as now claimed.

Applicant's specifically note with regard to the rejections based upon the Saito reference that each of the different structures described in this reference are actually physically distinct different layers and are described as such throughout the specification of this reference including the translation of this Japanese language document. Applicants acknowledge that the translation indicates that the distinct diffusion layer and light distribution layer of this reference are comprised of different materials, however, Applicants note that the presently claimed invention is actually directed to a diffuser body having distinct diffusion elements incorporated within the continuous body of resin material for the diffuser body. Saito clearly does not teach or even remotely suggest such a structure. Applicants unique and advantageous structure can be manufactured in an economically advantageous and rapid process. In contrast, the prior art requires the separate manufacture of each of the distinct elements required for forming the described display.

Applicants further note that the alternate Yu reference similarly suffers from the same deficiencies as those noted with respect to Saito. Applicant specifically note that each of the structures relied upon by the Examiner in support

U.S. Serial No. 10/571,044
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2007
Amendment dated: February 21, 2008

of the previous rejection are actually individual distinct layers of material or separate structures and therefore clearly do not support the Examiner's rejections.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicants respects we submit that all claims now standing condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/21/08

(Reg. 37,607)

Robert J. Depke

ROCKEY, DEPKE & LYONS, LLC

Sears Tower, Suite 5450

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6306

Tel: (312) 277-2006

Attorney for Applicants

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 21 2008**

U.S. Serial No. 10/571,044
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2007
Amendment dated: February 21, 2008

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicants have amended Figures 1A-5 to include the legend "PRIOR ART", as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.